	Case 1:20-cv-00032-DAD-GSA Docume	ent 7 Filed 04/28/20 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CARLOS RODOLFO MARROQUIN,	No. 1:20-cv-00032-DAD-GSA (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
14	VALLEY STATE PRISON, et al.,	RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING ACTION DUE TO PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE
15	Defendants.	TO COMPLY WITH A COURT ORDER AND FAILURE TO PROSECUTE
16		(Doc. No. 6)
17		
18		
19	Plaintiff Carlos Rodolfo Marroquin is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights	
20	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate	
21	Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
22	The complaint commencing this action was originally filed by fifteen plaintiffs on	
23	December 26, 2019. See Gann v. Valley State Prison, 1:19-cv-01797-DAD-GSA, (Doc. No. 1).	
24	Thereafter, on January 7, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge issued an order severing the fifteen	
25	plaintiffs' claims and opened this new case for plaintiff Marroquin. (Doc. No. 1.) The January 7,	
26	2020 order also directed plaintiff to file an amended complaint and an application to proceed in	
27	forma pauperis in this case within thirty (30) days from the date of service of that order. (Id. at	
28		
		1

## 1 4–5.) The thirty-day deadline passed, and plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint, file an 2 application to proceed in forma pauperis, or pay the required filing fee. 3 Therefore, on March 25, 2020, the magistrate judge issued the pending findings and 4 recommendations, recommending dismissal of this action, without prejudice, due to plaintiff's 5 failure to obey a court order and failure to prosecute this action. (Doc. No. 6.) The pending 6 findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections 7 thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (Id. at 3.) To date, no objections 8 have been filed, and the time in which to do so has now passed. 9 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a 10 de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the 11 findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. 12 Accordingly: 13 1. The March 25, 2020 findings and recommendations (Doc No. 6) are adopted in 14 full; 2. 15 This action is dismissed, without prejudice, due to plaintiff's failure to obey a 16 court order and failure to prosecute this action; and 17 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case. 18 IT IS SO ORDERED. 19 **April 28, 2020** Dated: 20 21 22 23 24

25

26

27

28